DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 944 CS 208 906

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE Cinema Screen Advertising: An Old Technology with New Promise for Consumer Marketing.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; Audience Analysis; *Commercial Art; *Films; Journalism; *Media Research; *Merchandising; Research Needs; Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Response

ABSTRACT

Few individuals think of the theatrically exhibited motion picture as supported by advertising like other major forms of mass communications. Cinema screen advertising can be defined as the presentation of individual advertising messages on movie theatre screens in a distinct and discrete fashion. Screenvision ads run prior to the start of each feature film and promote such products as automobiles, videogames and home computers, fashions, beer and soft drinks, travel, cameras, and film. While relatively scarce until recently in the United States, cinema advertising has long been a part of the European cinema experience. Although there is a dearth of movie audience research, the data suggest that cinema advertising does not significantly deter or inhibit attendance, nor do the ads appear to be especially aversive to a significant segment of the audience. The theatrical environment itself offers numerous unique advantages that should further increase its attractiveness as an advertising medium. The absolute size of the visual is larger than for any other moving image medium. In addition, it offers a more powerful, higher fidelity sound system than TV with stereo. The impact of new technologies may very well make the concept of cinema screen advertising even more attractive. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED255944

CINEMA SCREEN ADVERTISING: AN OLD TECHNOLOGY WITH NEW PROMISE FOR CONSUMER MARKETING

Bruce A. Austin

Rochester Institute of Technology
College of Liberal Arts
Rochester, New York 14623

A Paper Presented to the

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

Annual Convention

August 1985

Memphis, Tennessee

CS 208 906

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CINEMA SCREEN ADVERTISING: AN OLD TECHNOLOGY WITH NEW PROMISE FOR CONSUMER MARKETING

Virtually all of the American mass media are characterized as commercial in the sense of being advertising supported. The most commonplace and pervasive media -- newspapers, television, radio, and magazines -- all share this characteristic. Moreover, today there is much discussion about and important research conducted on how new and emerging communications technologies might be employed to meet advertising and marketing needs. This article examines a mass communications technology which has been present for a century but, among the advertising and marketing industries, has been virtually untapped as a medium for reaching American consumers.

Few individuals think of the theatrically exhibited motion picture as supported by advertising like other major forms of mass communications. Introductory mass communications, advertising, and marketing texts regularly omit mention of this notion. This article argues that in an age of new communications technologies, use of this older technology for advertising and marketing carries many of the same benefits and advantages as do the emerging ones. This article examines the concept of cinema advertising, presents previous and contemporary audience research on cinema ads, and argues that today, especially, this long-neglected milieu for the presentation of advertising messages should be adopted as a medium for the dissemination of information

by the consumer marketing and advertising industries.

MARKETING VIA THE MOVIES: HISTORY

As a vehicle for the placement and presentation of commercial advertising the cinema screen has a long, if largely unrecognized, history. Despite this, today the movie theater screen is typically not the medium that comes to mind as a means to offer or introduce a product or service to the public. Cinema screen advertising, though relatively scarce in this country, can be defined as the presentation of individual advertising messages on movie theater screens in a distinct and discrete fashion. Further, the messages themselves will typically offer products or services available nationally. In short, movie screen advertising largely resembles national television advertising in duration, form, and content. This definition, therefore, excludes from consideration messages restricted to localized geographic areas, the corporate sponsored film, and the placement of products as set pieces or props in movies.[1]

Advertising films first made their appearance in 1897, not more than one year after Thomas Edison's introduction of his movie Vitascope to the public at Koster and Bial's Music Hall in Herald Square. Early advertising films promoted such products as Admiral Cigarettes, Pabst's Milwaukee Beer, and Dewar's Whiskey; corporations employing such films included Nestle and Lever Brothers. Among those involved in the production of advertising films were such well-known

behind-the-camera individuals as Edison, Georges Melies in France, and Walter Ruttmann in Germany. Screen stars, too, were a part of cinema advertising. Dick Powell and Bette Davis were featured in a 1933 General Electric ad; and Greta Garbo's screen career began with her appearance in a Bergstrom Department Store of Stockholm screen advertisement (37, pp. 246-248).

In 1931 the Motion Picture Group of the New York Advertising Club offered a demonstration of "Talkie Advertising." On this occasion, Richard Strobridge, Secretary of Newell-Emmett Co., proposed that, "if it is wisely developed," movie advertising would, like radio advertising, add "to the stature of advertising and increase its public acceptance." Although more strenuously arguing for sponsored films, Strobridge asserted that movie ads "have furnished new opportunities and new angles of interest for the newspaper and magazine advertiser"(30). This early plea for attention, however, went largely unheeded -- at least in the U.S. -- until the mid-1950s.

At the same time television was becoming widely diffused and adopted in the United States, a consortium of five companies[2] formed the Association of Theatre Screen Advertising Companies. Renamed the Theatre-Screen Advertising Bureau (TSAB) in 1957, this organization was largely responsible for more than doubling the number of national advertisers running theater ads from fewer than 100 in 1950 to some 225 in 1958 (2). Following the logic that

television had (or would) accustom viewers to accept comercials accompanying their visual entertainment, all of the domestic automobile makers (except Cadillac), Coca-Cola, General Electric, International Harvester, U.S. Rubber, Carnation Milk, Rexall, Philco, B.F. Goodrich, Maytag, and other manufacturers began using movie theater screens to advertise their products (see 2, 45). In 1958 TSAB did a total of $20 million in business (45) and commercials were exhibited in 91 percent of all U.S. drive-in theaters and 85 percent of all conventional four-wall theaters (2). So successful was TSAB that they commissioned a major study by Sindlinger and Company to appraise the effectiveness of theater screen advertising (details of the study are presented below). However, for reasons not revealed by the available literature, virtually no information about U.S. cinema advertising appeared for the next two decades. A resurgence of interest in this topic and method for marketing and advertising occurred in 1977 (see 12; 20; 25, p.22).[3]

In 1977 Screenvision was created by Mediavision, a French cinema advertising company which is the largest in Europe. Debuting on October 26, some 1,800 theaters across the U.S. carried three minutes of advertising for such products as Chrysler cars and Seiko watches (46). In 1979 Screenvision was joined with Capital Cities Communication which, in 1981, sold their interest in Screenvision to FTTL Media Corporation. Today fifty percent of Screenvision is

still owned by Mediavision. Screenvision's only domestic competitor, Cinemavision (which also initiated operation in 1977), went out of business in 1978.

Screenvision ads run prior to the start of each feature film. To minimize clutter and adverse audience response, a total of three minutes of advertising time and three advertisers is available. Individual advertisers are sold a four-week flight; their ads may range from 60 to 90 seconds. Cost of advertising is based on a cost per thousands as determined by theater admissions (60-second spots at $17, 90-second spots at $24). To verify exhibition, report on audience reaction, and collect other data, Screenvision employs Certified Reports, Inc. Certified checks ten percent of all Screenvision theaters the first weekend of each four-week flight and ten percent (unduplicated) during the last weekend of each flight.

Presently, Screenvision has advertising running in some 170 markets on approximately 3,800 of the 18,500 U.S. movie screens (8); fewer than ten percent of the screens are drive-ins. During 1984 nearly 300 million advertising impressions are expected (17). Ads have appeared on the same screen as such boxoffice successes as Terms of Endearment, Silkwood, Flashdance, and Return of the Jedi. Advertisers, at their option, may have messages placed on a less-than-national basis; as few as one ADI may be purchased. Screenvision does not run ads with X-rated films.

Screenvision's promotional literature lists some 30 clients. The products advertised include automobiles, videogames and home computers, fashions, beer and soft drinks, travel and tourism, stereo equipment, cameras, and film. In general, Screenvision dos not accept ads which have run on television. The ads themselves are photographed in color and most use live action; some computer-generated animation has been employed. For maximum effectiveness Screenvision emphasizes "enjoyable advertising": messages which are entertaining (to match the motive for movie attendance), informative, and "as emotionally powerful as the movies themselves." Such advertising should involve the cinema patron "in a story where the product is the star," thereby engendering rewards for both the viewer -- with entertainment -- and the advertiser -- with a memorable, persuasive message.

While relatively scarce until recently in the U.S., cinema screen advertising has long been a part of the European cinema experience. Germany is credited as having produced the earliest known color (Das Wunder [The Wonder], 1925, for Kantorwicz Liqueur) and the first talkie advertising film (Die Chinesische Nachtigall [The Chinese Nightengale], 1928, for the Tri-Ergon Co.'s new process of disc recording) (37, p. 248). During 1983 some $40 million was spent on cinema advertising in Germany (16). In Switzerland and the Scandanavian countries, the frequency and percentage of cinema advertising has risen steadily

since 1979 (13, 15, 29, 31). Further, screen ads have been reported as having three to four times greater retention impact than newspaper ads in these countries (39). Projection of up to ten minutes of advertising is not unusual in European theaters today. Still, even overseas the popularity of the theater screen as a medium for the presentation of advertising is slight compared to other media. For instance, in 1982 only 1.5 percent of all Australian advertising expenditures were for cinema ads; during 1980 in Brazil, cinema advertising was nested with outdoor and point-of-sale advertising which, together, accounted for 3.9 percent of all advertising expenditures (1; 24, p. 213).

RESEARCH ON CINEMA SCREEN ADVERTISING

By itself, as well as compared to other mass media, the theatrical film audience has rarely been the subject for systematic, scholarly inquiry. Elsewhere I have detailed reasons and excuses for this paucity of research (see 4, pp. xvii-xlii; 5). Ironically, one reason for the dearth of movie audience research is that since the film industry itself does not sell advertising, "it does not need to account to anyone for the size of its audience" (21, p. 162; see also 18, pp. 5-6; and 36). Thus it is not unexpected that publicly available research on cinema screen advertising is scarce too.

Frank R. Elliott reported the earliest study of screen advertising in 1937 (9). His study attempted to assess differences in recall for product brand names as presented by three media: radio, television, and movie screen. Today, the value of his data is diminished by his method and procedures: an artificial laboratory setting, fictitious products, ad copy composed in typewriter type, and static images.

Perhaps a common -- if unarticulated -- concern about cinema screen advertising is that it would do more harm than good to both advertiser and theater operator. Public antagonism toward such advertising could result in diminished attendance and an unfavorable advertising ambience (of course people are not especially enamored of TV ads either). The available research, however, does not support the validity of such fears. From the results of a mail questionnaire, I. I. Raines reported in 1951 that advertising films had little impact on movie attendance patterns (34). When asked "if advertising films were not shown," only ten percent of the sample indicated they would attend movies more often; five percent said "less often" and 85 percent responded "just as often." Virtually all (91 percent) of Raines' sample (n = 279) reported they would not "be willing to pay a somewhat higher admission price" if advertising films, excluding trailers, were not shown. (It can be noted that a somewhat similar, though clearly not identical, attitude toward television commercials was

reported in Steiner's 1960 and Bower's 1970 study [see 6, 41]; 75 and 70 percent, respectively, agreed that "commercials are a fair price to pay for the entertainment you get.") Thirty-eight percent of Raines' respondents were "strongly in favor" or "in favor" of cinema screen advertising; 27 percent had no opinion, and 35 percent were "opposed" or "strongly opposed." Reasons for opposing screen ads are presented in Table 1. One-fifth

---

Table 1 About Here

---

felt the ads were an imposition, perhaps an obstacle difficult to overcome. The remainder, however, expressed reasons for opposing cinema ads which might easily be surrmounted by the creative individual. That is, an attractively designed, professionally produced, visually stimulating message of appropriate length might overcome audience objections.

More recently, research conducted by Trendex in 1980 found that, of those persons exposed to cinema ads, three percent said they would not return to the theater and 26 percent did "mind them" (percentages for persons not exposed to ads were five and 21 percent respectively). Trendex also reported that while only a modest percentage of those exposed to cinema ads felt the ads were "great" (ten percent), two-thirds (62 percent) said they "didn't mind them" (among those not exposed, seven percent said "great"

and 68 percent did not mind them) (see 19, p. 18).

Table 2 summarizes additional research commissioned by

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Screenvision on this topic.[4] As may be seen, among individuals exposed to a Renault 18i cinema ad, few (7 percent) expressed a negative response or indicated that the ad would affect their media consumption habits (10 percent). As compared to (any) television commercials, this study clearly indicates a far greater positive response toward the Renault ad than TV commercials. Justifiably, some would argue that such a comparison is spurious since a <u>particular</u> cinema ad was compared to <u>all</u> TV commercials. The second set of Burke data compare responses on equivalent question formats and concepts. Again, cinema ads were found to be superior to television in positive affect (58 to 36 percent) and only four percent of the respondents reported that cinema ads would cause them not to attend a theater running such ads.

The most recent research on this question is also the most convincing. Doyle Dane Bernbach Inc. conducted a three wave (day after, two weeks after, four weeks after), telephone interview study in six markets on an Atari cinema advertisement. The study employed a test (n = 288) and a control group (n = 298) which had had no Screenvision exposure. Although negative affective response was

virtually identical between those persons exposed and not exposed to cinema ads (32 and 34 percent respectively), positive response was clearly greater among those who saw the Atari ad. The differences between groups for a negative behavioral impact of cinema ads clearly supports the study's conclusion that "exposure to Screenvision increases positive attitudes toward cinema advertising." Data collected by Certified Reports for Screenvision during 1982-1984 found the following audience reactions to cinema ads: six percent "very favorable," 38 percent "favorable," "no audience reaction" 51 percent of the time, "some negative comments" and "very negative comments" four and one percent of the time respectively. Thus, despite reports which suggest that theatrical motion pictures are an attractive alternative to television because they are commercial-free (23, p. 12), these data suggest that cinema advertising would not significantly deter or inhibit attendance, nor do the ads appear to be especially aversive to a significant segment of the audience.

The Sindlinger study of cinema screen advertising, conducted for the Association of Theatre Screen Advertising Companies in 1954, is probably the largest-scale study of its type to date (40). The study involved six months of fieldwork in five U.S. cities with a total of 6,651 interviews conducted in theater lobbies, drive-in theaters, and residences. Albert E. Sindlinger himself wrote that the results of the study "clearly show that the audiences of

theatre screen advertising can be measured more accurately than the audiences of other advertising media." Using unaided recall, 96.6 percent of the respondents were able to correctly name at least one advertiser within one hour after exposure. Females were found to have somewhat better recall than males, and recall was highest among 25 to 34 year olds. Recall percentages beyond the 24-hour period also were high: 70.9 percent recall among those exposed to cinema ads up to one week earlier, 65.7 percent for one to four weeks, and 44.5 percent for one month to one year after exposure.

Data on audience recall of cinema screen advertising appears to be equally impressive today. Reporting British data, and noting that "it is almost impossible to avoid seeing the advertisements," Teer concluded that "the advertisers' basic requirements are . . . reasonably well met so far as the cinema is concerned" (43, p. 679). Research commissioned by Adfilms Ltd. in 1978 and 1981 found that, among persons attending Canadian drive-ins, unaided recall was 66 and 63 percent respectively. Research by Sindlinger in 1977 found 90 percent recall of one or more advertisers one hour after exposure; 1980 Trendex data showed 87 percent unaided recall one day after exposure to cinema advertising. Further, Trendex reported that the two-week after exposure recall percentages for screen ads (78 percent) exceeded average day-after recall percentages for television (19, p. 14). Similarly, Burke Marketing Research found that day-after recall for Screenvision ads

was 83 percent as compared to 23 percent for TV. And, in their three-wave panel study for Atari, Doyle Dane Bernbach reported recall of the Screenvision ad was high (82 percent), with no significant difference between day-after (87 percent), two weeks after (78 percent), or four weeks after (79 percent) exposure. Additionally, these impressive recall data -- clearly superior to television -- should mollify any concerns about the expense of producing and placing cinema ads.

AN ARGUMENT FOR ADOPTING CINEMA SCREEN ADVERTISING

Some will oppose cinema screen advertising in the belief that it is unacceptable to the theatrical film audience. Beyond the data reported above, which dispute this, such an argument also flies in the face of evidence from analogous "new" advertising environments. Recently, for instance, advertising -- up to ten and a half minutes an evening -- has been interspersed among music video clips at the Miller Time Concerts on the Pier in New York City with little apparent or overt audience resistance (7). Advertising on cable and premium cable television is well on its way to becoming commonplace. Perhaps the best evidence which refutes this argument against advertising on cinema screens is the research conducted on advertising on public television. Public Broadcasting has long been considered as an advertising-free haven. In 1981 the Public Broadcasting Amendments Act authorized limited advertising on certain PBS stations. The ELRA Group was commissioned to conduct

research on the effects of the presence of advertising on public television and audience attitudes. Data from more than 10,000 individuals were collected during 1982 and 1983. ELRA found that viewership was unchanged by the introduction of advertising. In addition, their research

> found no evidence that there were any harmful effects attributable to . . . advertising on public television . . . [,] no differences related to the type of advertising carried (i.e. product commercials vs. enhanced underwriting) . . . [,] general improvements in attitudes toward public television advertising . . . [and] no evidence of significant losses in private support. . . (10; see also 44).

Interestingly, cinema screen ads may be especially effective in reaching audiences "missed" by television. The Doyle Dane Bernbach study revealed that "cinema advertising reaches different people than does television advertising" -- moviegoers are lighter TV viewers.

The theatrical environment itself offers numerous unique advantages which should further increase its attractiveness as an advertising medium. The absolute size of the visual is larger than for any other moving image medium. The quality of film images is clearly superior to those of television which, given the present 525 scanning

line system, is a low resolution medium. Likewise, film offers a more powerful, higher fidelity sound system than TV with stereo sound available.[5] Unlike printed media, moving images are possible in the cinema; indeed, the audience expects this. And, if Screenvision's policies are followed or adopted, clutter and competition are eliminated as messages are presented to a captive audience receptive to emotionally involving, entertaining ads. Moreover, the Screenvision method for billing advertisers (cpm by admissions) provides data assuring advertisers exactly how many people their message reached.

The decision to employ the cinema screen as a medium for marketing consumer products -- as with any medium -- must, of course, be a judicious one. Criteria used to make such a decision would include the product's known, likely, and/or desired consumers. Additionally, the overall size and composition of the theatrical film audience is of importance.

Despite -- or, as I have argued elsewhere (3), perhaps because of -- the introduction of myriad new entertainment technologies, the theatrically exhibited film continues and will continue to prosper. New theater construction, according to recent reports, is at a record rate (27, 32). Projections for $4 billion in admissions in 1984 are common and realistic (42). And the total number of moviegoers aged 12 and older in 1983 was 121.6 million (26).

Table 3 presents selected demographic characteristics

Table 3 About Here

---

and the U.S. public's frequency of movie-going. As may be seen, a profile of the frequent moviegoers would suggest that they are evenly divided between males and females, better educated and younger than the average American, earn more than $20,000 annually, and hold professional positions. In short, frequent moviegoers are an upscale aggregate (see also 26). These data also refute the conversationally -- and usually disparagingly -- asserted comment that only teenagers go to the movies today. Clearly teenagers do go to the movies, but the data on income, education, and occupation indicates they are not the only ones attending.

Other characteristics of the movie audience are also relevant. The most frequently encountered attendance unit is two persons; few people go to the movies by themselves or with more than three other people. The median distance traveled to attend a movie is 4.9 miles. Attendance decisions are most often made on the same day as attendance occurs, with early evening or evening performances the shows most often selected (23, pp. 30, 31, 37). Audiences at theaters are largest on Saturdays followed by Fridays and then Sundays, with attendance levels fairly equal on Mondays through Thursdays. July, followed by August and January, are the months during which the greatest number of people go

to the movies; attendance is lowest during May (14, p. 29A). These seasonal and daily attendance trends have remained stable for years.

Concern about the future of the theatrical film and its audience has been raised vis-a-vis the new communications technologies (i.e., the alphabet soup of acronyms, e.g., MDS, LPTV, VCR, SMATV, etc.). On this point there is no shortage of doom and gloom prophets. There is also no question that a portion of today's cinema audience will be siphoned-off by these competing substitute technologies. As argued and documented elsewhere (3), however, a substantial "hardcore" theatrical film audience will remain despite the introduction, diffusion, and adoption of such technological innovations. When, in particular, such variables as time allocation and use of leisure time are "factored" into the "impact equation" it can be seen that a sizeable cinema audience will persist. Indeed, the impact of the new technologies may very well make the concept of cinema screen advertising all the more attractive. Exhibitors will (and have) become increasingly more receptive to this strategy as a means for making up revenues lost by the drop in attendance among peripheral moviegoers. Competition with new technologies will foster increased specialization and market segmentation across the board: among the kinds of films produced for theatrical release, where and how the films are exhibited (e.g., a rise in specialty theaters which offer only a particular kind of

film), and among audiences. Much as in the past when a new mass medium has been introduced -- e.g., the effect of television on the magazine and radio industries -- fragmentation and specialization among the "older" media will occur; due to this specialization, selective target audiences will become identifiable.

The above comments assume, of course, that the appropriate research is conducted prior to implementing a cinema screen advertising campaign. Additional questions for research that must be pursued include the following: What is the optimal length of a cinema screen advertisement? Are video ads equally effective when presented on cinema screens? What are the effects of clutter on cinema screen ads? How many are too many? Are there differences in ad effectiveness by type of movie screened or theater location?

CONCLUSION

In this article an argument for increased implementation of cinema screen advertising has been advanced. Although the concept itself is not new, its actual use has been slight. Evidence supporting the effectiveness and high recall of cinema ads has been presented; counterarguments have been refuted. In addition, points for future research have been suggested which, if implemented, should lead to further fine-tuning and increased efficacy of theatrical screen advertising.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This is not intended to diminish the value of these strategies; they are, however, beyond the scope of this article. For a useful discussion of the sponsored film see 33 and 35. Rotkin reports that audiences do recognize and recall brand name products depicted in movies (see 38 and 22).

[2] The companies were: Alexander Film Co., Colorado Springs, CO; A. V. Cauger Service, Independence, MO; Motion Picture Advertising Service Co., New Orleans, LA; Reid H. Ray Film Industries, St. Paul, MN; United Film Service, Kansas City, MO. In Canada, Adfilms Limited was founded in 1953 and still offers French and English language cinema ads.

[3] It should be noted that this renewed interest was not welcomed by all (see 11). Twentieth Century-Fox found screen advertising "a practice we deplore" and "has taken a strong stand to discourage" it by stating in its film bid solicitations that revenues generated by screen ads be included in the theater's gross receipts (see 28).

[4] These data were supplied by Screenvision to the author. Citations for this research are: Burke Marketing Research Inc., "Cinema Advertising Evaluation Study for Screenvision," October 1980 and December 1980; Doyle Dane Bernbach Inc., "An Investigation of Screenvision for 'The Fly,'" prepared for Atari, Inc., December 1982.

[5] High definition television is still years away from actual implementation. Stereo TV sound, while authorized by the FCC, has just begun in terms of broadcasters' adoption of it, manufacturers producing the necessary receiving equipment, and audience adoption of such equipment (see 3).

REFERENCES

1. "Advertising Expenditure in Main Media 1982." Media Information Australia, no. 32, May 1984, p. 63.

2. "Advertising in the Movies: An Old Medium with New Services, New Strengths." Printers' Ink 264, August 1, 1958, pp. 50-51.

3. Austin, Bruce A. "The Film Industry, Its Audience and New Communications Technologies," in Bruce A. Austin (Ed.), Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics and Law, vol. 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp., in press.

4. Austin, Bruce A. "The Motion Picture Audience: A Neglected Aspect of Film Research" in The Film Audience: An International Bibliography of Research with Annotations and an Essay. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1983.

5. Austin, Bruce A. "Researching the Film Audience: Purposes, Procedures, and Problems." Journal of the University Film and Video Association 35, Summer 1983, pp. 34-43.

6. Bower, Robert T. Television and the Public. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

7. DiMauro, Phil. "Commercials Invading Concerts; Rock Fans a Captive Audience." Variety, July 25, 1984, pp. 2, 82.

8. "Eastern News: Philadelphia." Boxoffice 120 (7), July 1984, p. 29.

9. Elliott, Frank R. "Memory for Trade Names Presented in Screen, Radio and Television Advertisements." Journal of Applied Psychology 21, 1937, 653-667.

10. ELRA Group. Executive Summary, The People Look at Advertising on Public Television. East Lansing, MI: ELRA Group, 1984.

11. Farley, Ellen. "Movie-Screen Commercials Running Into

Resistance." Los Angeles Times, January 1, 1978, Calendar sec., pp. 32, 34-36.

12. Farley, Ellen. "Finding Commercials at the Movies." Los Angeles Times, October 28, 1977, Part VI, pp. 11-12.
13. Fields, Donald. "Advertising Industry Buoyant in Europe's Last Boom Area." Campaign Europe, November 1980, pp. 59-63.
14. Gertner, Richard (Ed.). Motion Picture Almanac 1984. New York: Quigley Publishing Co., 1984.
15. Hedges, Martin. "A Testing Time for Denmark's Daily Newspapers." Campaign Europe, September 1979, pp.59-62.
16. "In-Theater Ads Off 4.9% in German Mkt." Variety, February 29, 1984, p. 35.
17. "In-Theatre Commercials on Upswing in 1984." Boxoffice 120 (4), April 1984, pp. 65, 67.
18. Jarvie, I. C. Movies and Society. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
19. Johnson, Keith F. "Cinema Advertising." Journal of Advertising 10 (4), 1981, pp. 11-19.
20. Lasoff, Sam. "Big-Screen Commercials: Faster Relief for Exhibitors?" Film Comment 15 (1), January-February 1979, pp. 66-68.
21. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Audience Research in the Movie Field." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 254, November 1947, pp. 160-168.
22. Linck, David. "Brand Names Go Hollywood: Props that Sell." Boxoffice 118 (4), April 1982, pp. 32-33.
23. Los Angeles Times. A Look at Southern California Movie-Going. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Times Marketing Research, 1972.
24. Mattos, Sergio. "Advertising and Government Influences: A

Case of Brazilian Television." Communication Research 11 (2), April 1984, pp. 203-220.

25. Mayer, Michael F. The Film Industries, 2nd ed. New York: Hastings House, 1978.
26. Motion Picture Association of America. "Incidence of Motion Picture Attendance." New York: MPAA, July 1983.
27. "Movie Screens are Popping Up All Over." BusinessWeek, May 14, ,1984, pp. 76, 81.
28. Myers, Peter S. "The Studio as Distributor," pp. 275-284 in Jason E. Squire (Ed.), The Movie Business Book. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
29. Noble, David. "Why the Swede's are the World's Most Avid Readers." Campaign Europe, September 1979, pp. 39, 41.
30. "An Opinion on Screen Advertising." Educational Screen 10, April 1931, p. 112.
31. Parry, John. "Will Schurman Bring New Life to the Swiss Ad Industry?" Campaign Europe, May 1981, pp. 20-21.
32. Pauley, David with David T. Friendly and Michael Reese. "Big Bucks for the Big Screens." Newsweek, May 28, 1984, p. 63.
33. Perkins, Daniel J. "The Sponsored Film: A New Dimension in American Film Research?" Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television 2 (2), 1982, pp. 133-140.
34. Raines, I. I. "Preferences of a Small Town Motion Picture Audience." Current Economic Comment, May 1951, pp. 51-59.
35. Randall, Robert. "Notes on the Sponsored Film," pp. 295-297 in William A. Bluem and Jason E. Squire (Eds.), The Movie Business. New York: Hastings House, 1972.

36. Riesman, David and Evelyn Riesman. "Movies and Audiences." American Quarterly 4, 1952, pp. 195-202.

37. Robertson, Patrick. Movie Facts and Feats. New York: Sterling Publishing Co., 1980.

38. Rotkin, Nora J. "Product Visibility in Motion Pictures." Marketing Communications, July 1982, pp. 4-5.

39. "Screen Ads are Big in Sweden; 'Impact' Greater than Newsprint." Variety, October 8, 1980, p. 49.

40. Sindlinger and Company, Inc. A Study and Analysis of Theatre Screen Advertising, March 1955. In National Association of Theatre Owners archives, Brigham Young University, Box 8, Folder 15.

41. Steiner, Gary A. The People Look at Television: A Study of Audience Attitudes. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

42. "TEA Meeting Looks to Bright Future." Boxoffice 120 (7), July 1984, p. 18.

43. Teer, Frank. "Radio, Outdoor and Cinema Research," pp. 657-679 in Robert M. Worcester and John Downham (Eds.). Consumer Market Research Handbook, 2nd ed. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1978.

44. Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing for Public Telecommunications. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Federal Communications Commission, October 1983.

45. "Theatre-Screen Ad Business Holds Own as TV Educates Viewers to Accept Movie Ads." Advertising Age, July 7, 1958, p. 74.

46. "Tonight at the Movies: The Latest National Ads." BusinessWeek, October 24, 1977, p. 39.

TABLE 1

Reasons for Opposing Cinema Advertising in 1951*

Objection	Percent
Takes too long	22
Showing is an imposition	21
Uninteresting presentation	20
Not interested in products	19
Poor photography and sound	5
Other	13

*Source: Raines (34, p. 59).

TABLE 2
Attitudes Toward Cinema Screen and TV Advertising

	Burke Marketing Research, Sept. 1980		Burke Marketing Research, Dec. 1980		Doyle Dane Bernbach, Dec. 1982		
	any TV commercial	Renault 18i cinema commercial	commercials on television	commercials in theaters	not exposed to cinema ads	exposed to cinema ads	total
Great/Like very much	--%	25%	1%	8%	3%	7%	5%
Don't mind/Like somewhat	31	36	35	50	42	59	51
Neither like nor dislike	--	19	*	*	*	*	*
Do mind/Dislike somewhat	37	7	39	37	34	32	33
Would never go back to that theater	*	*	22[a]	4	19	2	10
Dislike enough to affect media consumption habits	30	10	*	*	*	*	*
Don't know/No answer	1	4	3	1	2	--	1

* not presented as a response option

[a]response of "I hardly ever watch television"

TABLE 3

Selected U.S. Audience Demographic Characteristics by Frequency of Movie Attendance Within the Last 30 Days*

	Attended 1 or more times	1 time	2 times	3 or 4 times	5 or more times	Did not attend
SEX						
Male	24%	14%	4%	4%	2%	76%
Female	23	12	5	4	2	77
RACE						
White	24	14	5	4	1	76
Non-white	18	7	5	3	3	82
EDUCATION						
College	34	19	7	4	4	66
High School	23	12	5	5	1	77
Grade School	6	4	1	**	**	94
REGION						
East	26	13	8	4	1	74
Midwest	23	13	3	5	2	77
South	18	10	3	3	2	82
West	29	18	5	4	2	71
AGE						
Total Under 30	43	21	10	8	4	57
18-24 years	46	21	12	9	4	54
25-29 years	34	22	5	5	2	66
30-49 years	27	17	5	4	1	73
50 and older	9	5	2	1	1	91
INCOME						
$25,000 and over	28	16	6	3	3	72
$20,000-$24,999	34	19	6	8	1	66
$15,000-$19,999	24	17	4	2	1	76
$10,000-$14,999	27	13	7	5	2	73
OCCUPATION						
Professional and Business	33	18	6	5	4	67
Clerical and Sales	26	11	9	4	2	74
Manual Workers	26	17	4	4	1	74
CITY SIZE						
1,000,000 and over	29	15	5	7	2	71
5,000,000-999,999	17	7	3	4	3	83
50,000-499,999	29	16	6	5	2	71
2,500-49,999	22	15	3	1	3	78
Under 2,500, rural	19	11	5	2	1	81

* Source: The Gallup Report, "Gallup Looks at the Movies," December 1981, p. 6
**indicate less than one percent.